

GEORGE PROBY, JR.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) No. 4:14CV1355 HEA
)
D.R. BULLOCK, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

After considering these factors, the Court finds that the appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time. As this Court has previously noted on October 8, 2014, in its Order denying plaintiff's first motion for appointment of counsel [Doc. #11], this case is neither factually nor legally complex. Moreover, it is evident that Plaintiff is able to present his claims, because the Court has ordered Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's claims. Finally, although

Plaintiff summarily asserts that his “imprisonment will greatly limit his ability to litigate,” the Court finds that the appointment of counsel would be premature at this time.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel [Doc. #35] is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

Dated this 9th day of January, 2015.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Henry Edward Autrey", is positioned above a horizontal line. The signature is cursive and fluid, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE